Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/789,400	COLLINS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Shin-Lin Chen	1632

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
	(1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the happeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONL	Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorteneset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ad statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 September 2009</u> . A brief in the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must lead to the contract of the contract	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the
AMENDMENTS	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prio (a) They raise new issues that would require further considera (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); They are not deemed to place the application in better form 	tion and/or search (see NOTE below);
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresp	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	e attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. $oxed{\boxtimes}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See C	Continuation Sheet.
non-allowable claim(s).	e if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided by The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-6,15-19,25,26,58 and 59. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.	,
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffici was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notic entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcon showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and w	ne <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	e status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet.	NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/S	B/08) Paper No(s)
13. Other:	
	/Shin-Lin Chen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1632

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 55 and 56 because claims 55 and 56 have been canceled.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that claism 1, 15 and 16 have been amended to limit the scope of the claims to mutation that ablate expression of the M2-2 protein. Applicants listed 8 GenBank Accession Nos. of HMPV sequences and argue that the disclosed M2-2 nucleotide sequence is sufficiently homologous to those of other HMPV strains to adequately describe the claimed subject matter. The HMPV M2-2- protein is encoded by highly conserved nucleotide sequence from strain to strain and one of skilled in the art would readily identify the M2-2- protein of HMPV by performing sequence analysis and to create an rHMPV having one or more mutations that ablate the expression of the M2-2 protein (amendment, p. 5-7). This is not found persuasive because of the reasons of record. The listed GenBank Accession Nos. of HMPV sequences are published after the effective filing date of the instant invention (2-28-03). AY530089 to AY530094 were published on 1-19-04, DQ843658 was published on 7-10-06 and FJ168779 was published on 8-28-08. None of those sequences were published at the time of the invention. The specification fails to provide the structural features of the variants that one skilled in the art can envision the nucleotide sequence of any other HMPV strain or substrain. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. It is apparent that applicants only have possession of the nucleotide seguence of HMPV strain 83 and strain 75 but do NOT have possession of nucleotide seguence of any other HMPV strains or substrains. The nucleotide sequences of SEQ ID Nos. 1 and 2 are insufficient to describe the claimed recombinant HMPVs. Absent possession of the claimed rHMPV other than the disclosed SEQ ID Nos. 1 and 2, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would not know how to use the claimed rHMPV without undue experimentation. Further, the specification also fails to provide adequate guidance and evidence for whether and what kind of phenotypic change of the rHMPV could be resulted by partial or complete deletion of rHMPV M2-2 ORF or one or more nucleotide substitutions that ablates expression of the M2-2 ORF. One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would require undue experimentation to practice over the full scope of the invention claimed.